REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. <u>Rejection of Claims 1-6 Under 35 USC §112, 2nd Paragraph</u>

This rejection has been addressed by amending claim 1 to clarify that the pair of said signals are a pair of the data signals, and that there are two sets of spread signals, one of which results from spreading the pair of data signals using a complex multiplier to obtain complex valued spread signals, and the other of which results from spreading the remaining data signals.

As shown in Fig. 11a and described on page 45 of the original specification, the pair of data signal corresponds to signals SCH#1 and SCH#2. These signals are supplied to complex multiplier 142 to obtain the *first* complex valued signals $S_I[n]$ and $S_Q[n]$. In addition, the remaining data signals P_iCH, DCCH, and FCH, are individually spread by spreaders 1120, 1122, and 1128 to obtain *second* spread signals. The first and second spread signals are then supplied to adder 130 and 132 where they are added together.

It is respectfully submitted that the recitations of the pair of signals and the complex valued signals are now clear and in compliance with the original disclosure, and therefore that the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 USC §112, 2nd Paragraph has been overcome without adding "new matter."

2. <u>Allowability of Claims 1-6</u>

Claims 1-6 now more positively recite use of a <u>complex multiplier</u> to convert a <u>pair</u> of the data signals into complex valued signals for subsequent combination with the remaining spread data signals. None of the references of record discloses or suggests such a <u>complex multiplier</u>. The use of a complex multiplier for scrambling is of course known, but not the use of an *additional* complex multiplier for combining and spreading a pair of the input data signals.

3.   Formalities

Element 142 shown in Fig. 11a was mis-numbered as element 145 on pages 44 and 45 of the original specification. This formal error has now been corrected by amending the specification to refer to –complex multiplier 142– rather than "complex multiplier 145."

In addition, the typographic error in line 6 has been addressed by changing "signals signals" to –signals–, as suggested by the Examiner.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
        Registration No. 33,805

Date: March 13, 2006

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB:S:\Producer\beu\Pending 1...P\K\KIMJ 890249\a02.wpd